



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/933,067	08/20/2001	Steve Brandstetter	P/94-1	6703
7590	02/25/2010		EXAMINER	
Philip M. Weiss, Esq. Weiss & Weiss Suite 251 300 Old Country Road Mineola, NY 11501			COBURN, CORBETT B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3714	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/25/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/933,067	BRANDSTETTER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Corbett B. Coburn	3714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 February 2010.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-9, 11-13, 16 and 18 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-9, 11-13, 16 and 18 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Examiner's Note

1. It appears that in Case Number A571641 in the District Court of Clark County, Nevada, Applicant has alleged (on page 25 of his complaint) that several parties have misappropriated his trade secrets in connection with this invention. It follows from this that a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, 1st paragraph might be appropriate since if Applicant has maintained valuable trade secrets in connection with the making or use of this invention, then he has not disclosed the best mode of carrying out his invention as required by the statute.

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Examiner would ask Applicant to clarify the record regarding this issue if Applicant elects to proceed.
3. Examiner would also remind Applicant of his continuing duty to disclose all information that is material to patentability of this application. This includes not only prior art, but anything that is material to questions raised by the statutes —including 35 U.S.C. §101 & 112.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
5. Claims 1-6, 9, 12, & 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okuniewicz (US Patent Number 6,585,589) in view of Quinn (US Patent Number 3,688,276).

Claim 1: Okuniewicz teaches device for paying out a bonus (Col 1, 43-46) to a player playing a gaming machine. (Fig 1) There is a gaming machine (Slot Machine). The gaming machine obviously contains a processor for implementing a game of chance (including video poker) and paying off according to matching symbols. (Col 1, 20) There is a dispensing unit (Lottery Terminal). Since Okuniewicz teaches that the dispensing unit may dispense a ticket when a preset amount of coins are inserted (Col 3, 46-53), there must be a numeric counter for counting the number of coins placed in said gaming machine that counts coins until a ticket is generated. Okuniewicz does not teach visually displaying to the player the number of coins needed to generate a ticket or the number of coins inserted by the player. Nor does Okuniewicz teach resetting the counted coins to zero once a ticket is generated. These are common functions on virtually any modern vending machine.

Quinn, which is also a lottery ticket dispenser, teaches visually displaying to the player the number of coins needed to generate a ticket and the number of coins inserted by the player as well as resetting the counted coins to zero once a ticket is generated. (Fig 1) Such a visible meter allows the player to know how much money he must insert and how much money he has inserted. Clearing the counter lets the player know that if he wants another ticket, he has to put in more money. These features add to user convenience and are, as previously pointed out, extremely well known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Okuniewicz in view of Quinn to visually display to the player the number of coins needed to generate a ticket and the number of coins inserted by the player as well as

to reset the counted coins to zero once a ticket is generated in order to add to player convenience.

Furthermore, a combination of prior art elements, each performing their normal functions in a predictable manner to yield a predictable result is obvious. In this case, Okuniewicz teaches a slot machine that dispenses a lottery ticket when a preset number of coins have been inserted into the machine. Quinn, which also dispenses a lottery ticket when a preset number of coins have been inserted into the machine, has a meter that displays the number of coins inserted and the number of coins remaining prior to dispensing a ticket. In the combination, Okuniewicz's slot machine/ticket dispenser works in its accustomed manner. Quinn's lottery ticket dispenser/coin meter work in its accustomed manner. The combination of Okuniewicz and Quinn yield predictable results. The combination is therefore obvious.

Regarding the ticket being supplemental to a gaming award, see the underlined portion of the rejection above. Regarding the numeric counter continuing to count (presumably coins) from player to player until the dispensing unit dispenses a ticket, Okuniewicz has no mechanism for determining who deposits a coin. Neither does Quinn. Clearly, since neither device can determine when one player leaves & another player arrives, the numeric counters in both would continue to count coins until a ticket is dispensed.

Claims 2-4: Okuniewicz teaches that the dispensing unit may be a retrofit unit for a slot machine (Col 3, 1-4). Okuniewicz teaches that the dispensing unit could be attached to the gaming machine externally (i.e., side-mounted) or mounted internally. (Col 4, 63-66)

Claim 5: The gaming machine may include video poker machines (Col 3, 36-42). Video bingo games and video keno games are disclosed as equivalents.

Claim 6: The dispensing unit is a self-contained unit that does not affect play or outcome of said gaming machine. (Col 4, 35-43)

Claim 9: Okuniewicz dispenses lottery tickets. (Abstract)

Claim 12: Claim 12 is a combination of claims 1, 5, & 9 with the addition of holding a drawing to determine a winner of said ticket – which is taught by Okuniewicz.

Claim 16: Okuniewicz teaches the lottery ticket may be for the Big Game. In the Big Game, a bonus prize is generated from a percentage of total coins placed into all participating gaming machines (i.e., a percentage of money used to buy game tickets).

6. Claims 7, 8, 11, 13 & 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okuniewicz and Quinn as applied to claim 1, 12 above, and further in view of Castellano et al. (US Patent Number 5,477952).

Claims 7, 13: Okuniewicz and Quinn teach the invention substantially as claimed. Both contain coin counters, but do not give details of the operation thereof. Okuniewicz bonuses a player based on number of coins played (Col 3, 51) but does not teach that the numeric counter counts coin pulses off of the gaming machine's hard meter. Castellano teaches the method of operation of the coin counters. Castellano teaches that the numeric counter (12) counts coin pulses off of the gaming machine's hard meter (52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Okuniewicz and Quinn in view of Castellano to have the numeric counter count coin pulses off of the gaming machine's hard meter in order to carry out Okuniewicz and

Quinn's suggestion to count the coins entered by the player.

Claim 8: Okuniewicz and Quinn teach the invention substantially as claimed. Neither specifically discloses that the numeric counter can count various coin denominations. Castellano specifically teaches that the numeric counter can count various coin denominations. (Fig 1, 21-24) Allowing players to use more than one denomination makes it convenient for the player to put more money in the slot machine. This increases profits. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Okuniewicz and Quinn in view of Castellano to have the numeric counter can count various coin denominations in order to make it convenient for the player to put more money in the slot machine.

Claims 11, 18: Okuniewicz teaches that the benefit of the device is the ability to change the criteria for generating a ticket. (Col 3, 1-9) The LIB is a remote unit (i.e., a separate module) for changing the number of coins necessary to generate said ticket.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 1 February 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
8. Applicant argues that Okuniewicz lacks a numeric counter for counting coins. This is clearly in error. Okuniewicz clearly states that one of the conditions that can result in the vending of a ticket is the number of coins deposited into the gaming machines. Without a coin counter, then it would be impossible to determine when that condition is met. What Okuniewicz does not do is to display the number of coins in to the user. Quinn displays the number of coins

placed into a machine. This shows that the elements were known at the time of the invention & that their combination in a known manner would yield predictable results

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Corbett B. Coburn whose telephone number is (571) 272-4447. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on (571) 272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Corbett B. Coburn/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3714